# Conflict, consensus and closure in Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Enūma eliš*

Johannes Haubold

Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Babylonian *Enūma eliš* both move from chaos to order, divine conflict to consensus. They draw on the narrative template of a myth of succession among the gods which culminates in the current ruler of the universe ascending to power, and remaining in power for ever more: Zeus in the *Theogony*, Marduk in *Enūma eliš*. However, the two texts interpret this general template differently: whereas *Enūma eliš* concentrates on clashes between the younger gods and the primordial couple Apsû and Tiāmat, conflict is passed down the generations in the *Theogony*. When resolution comes, the two texts again adopt different approaches: whereas the *Theogony* plays down consensus among the gods and the closure it brings, the opposite is true of *Enūma eliš*. I argue that these fundamental differences between the two texts are facets of a coherent strategy of adaptation: Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Babylonian *Enūma eliš* shape the succession myth so as to make it fit their distinct contexts of performance and reception. The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate that Greeks and Babylonians drew on a shared stock of narrative themes and techniques when describing the earliest history of the universe – and that by comparing the two traditions we can hope to gain a better understanding of each.

## COMPARATIVE READING

The comparative method employed in this chapter deserves some explanation, before entering into detailed textual analysis. There has been much work, over the past few decades, on parallels between ancient Greek and non-Greek texts. This work has had the important effect of wrenching Greek epic out of an artificial isolation imposed by European exceptionalism, disciplinary compartmentalisation, and sheer intellectual habit.[1] But it has also had the unfortunate side-effect of creating a false dichotomy between those who read epic, and those who study its Near Eastern context and background. Classicists emphasise the importance of literary interpretation, and

rightly insist that the search for Near Eastern parallels must not go at the expense of reading the texts as continuous wholes.[2] The so-called succession myth is a case in point: today, there can no longer be any doubt that it provided a shared template for cosmogonic narrative in the ancient Mediterranean and the Near East. Yet this realisation has sometimes distracted scholars from asking how each individual text presented its narrative, and how it spoke to its ancient, and indeed modern, readers. These, it seems to me, are questions that any serious student of comparative literature must be prepared to address. The challenge, in other words, remains that of reading the ancient texts in a sustained and committed way, rather than extracting generalised theories of cultural contact from them.

There are several practical consequences for the comparative reading advanced in this chapter. First, my main emphasis will not be on the broad similarities between texts but on such differences as can illuminate their specific form and meaning. Secondly, I aim to arrive at a coherent reading of all texts under consideration, not just those composed in Greek. It is sometimes asserted, and more often implied, that a balanced approach of this kind diverts attention from Greek epic, but in fact the opposite seems to me to be true: any hope we have of learning new things from comparison depends, arguably, on our willingness to let all the texts we compare speak to us.[3]

My third point follows from the first two. Although this chapter starts from the myth of divine succession, I make no attempt to cover all known examples of this myth, or even just a representative sample.[4] It is a well-known principle of comparative literature that the parameters of comparison are determined by the outcomes we seek. Comparison, in other words, is a heuristic tool rather than an end in itself: there is no single 'right' way of doing it, though there are of course more or less fruitful approaches in any given circumstance, and depending on the particular aim of the enquiry.[5] What seems to me to be fruitful, indeed urgent, in the comparative study of ancient texts, is that we experiment with new forms of close reading, rather than limiting the enterprise to historical problems, such the identification of sources and routes of transmission. The experiment, in this case, is to take just one example of the Near Eastern succession myth, the *Enūma eliš*, and read it against Hesiod's *Theogony*.[6] This allows for a close reading of each text.

## SUCCESSION MYTHS

Hesiod's *Theogony* starts with a gaping space (Gk. Χάος) that gradually fills with the features of the known universe: earth and the underworld, night and day, the sky, the sea and the mountains. These entities are envisaged as divine,[7] and as they are born, conflict erupts among them. Sky oppresses his partner Earth and is castrated by their son Kronos (154-82). Kronos becomes the new ruler, but in turn comes into conflict with his own children. He tries to suppress them, and fails (453-506). Battle is joined between Kronos and his children. The younger gods prevail (617-721) and Zeus goes on to defeat Typhoeus (820-80), after which he is declared king of the gods (881-5) and harmony is restored.

The Babylonian *Enūma eliš* has a similar structure, as is well known. It starts with Apsû and Tiāmat mingling their waters together (I.5). Heaven and earth were not yet in existence at this point, nor were there any gods (I.1-8). As the gods are born, conflict erupts: first, the primordial father Apsû tries to suppress his boisterous offspring and suffers defeat at the hands of his own descendant Ea (I.25-72). Matters escalate when Tiāmat, the primordial mother, turns on the gods, creates an army of monsters and threatens to throw the world into chaos (I.125-62). Marduk takes on Tiāmat and defeats her (II.127-IV.134), at which point the gods declare him king (V.107-58), and the universe acquires its present shape.

The similarities between *Enūma eliš* and the *Theogony* are evident and important: both texts employ a version of the so-called succession myth, an ancient Levantine template for how order emerges out of chaos.[8] Important elements in this story include, first, the idea that the cosmos functions like a monarchy, and that its history is best described in terms of the history of kingship as an institution. The rise to power of the ruling god is envisaged as unfolding over several generations (hence the name 'succession myth') and is thought to entail violent clashes between various pretenders to the heavenly throne. In the *Theogony*, the succession myth spans three generations of dominant male gods, from Sky (Gk. Οὔρανος) to his son Kronos, and finally his grandson Zeus, the current king (βασιλεύς) of the gods. In *Enūma eliš*, a similar line of gods rounds off the divine family tree, again starting with the Sky-god (Akk. *Anu*) and continuing with his clever son Ea (often compared to 'scheming' Kronos) and his grandson Marduk, the current king of the gods in Babylonian tradition.[9] Ancient readers saw these gods as broadly equivalent, to the point of translating Marduk into Zeus (Herodotus) and Ea into Kronos (Berossos).[10] Anatolian

parallels suggest that Sky and his two successors were stock characters in ancient succession myths, but they also confirm that there was room for variation.[11] Thus, Hesiod sees Sky as one of the oldest deities, while *Enūma eliš* traces the divine family back a further two or perhaps three generations.[12] More importantly for the present argument, Sky and his descendants clash in the *Theogony* but not in *Enūma eliš*, where they work together towards the shared goal of defeating Apsû and Tiāmat.

## CONFLICT AND CONSENSUS

The *Theogony* interprets cosmogony in strictly generational terms, as a struggle between successive fathers and sons. This is how Hesiod first introduces the succession theme in the *Theogony* proem:

> … ὃ δ᾽ οὐρανῷ ἐμβασιλεύει,
> αὐτὸς ἔχων βροντὴν ἠδ᾽ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,
> κάρτει νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον εὖ δὲ ἕκαστα
> ἀθανάτοις διέταξεν ὁμῶς καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμάς.
>
> ... but Zeus is king in heaven,
> he alone commands thunder and the burning lightning bolt,
> after defeating his father Kronos by force. He has arranged everything well
> for the immortals and assigned them their roles.[13]
>
> Hesiod, *Theogony* 71-4

Zeus' role as king of the gods (οὐρανῷ ἐμβασιλεύει) is to be understood as the direct result of conflict with his father: κάρτει νικήσας suggests violence, and reference to 'father Kronos' (πατέρα Κρόνον) spells out the family dynamic. By this point in the text, Zeus' traditional epithet Kronides/Kronion has already appeared twice, and it will appear several times more to remind us of how Zeus came to power.[14] In fact, all major stages of the Hesiodic succession play out as conflicts between father and son. The theme is already evident when Kronos castrates Sky:

μῆτερ, ἐγώ κεν τοῦτό γ᾽ ὑποσχόμενος τελέσαιμι
ἔργον, ἐπεὶ πατρός γε δυσωνύμου οὐκ ἀλεγίζω
ἠμετέρου: πρότερος γὰρ ἀεικέα μήσατο ἔργα.

Mother, I promise you this deed and will bring it about,
since I do not care for our unspeakable father:
for he was the first to devise shameful deeds.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 170-2

The main point of Kronos' speech is arguably to confirm the family dynamic that drives the disagreement: he does not simply rebel against the incumbent ruler but specifically takes on his father (πατρός γε δυσωνύμου οὐκ ἀλεγίζω).[15] The pattern is repeated in the next generation, when Zeus overthrows his father Kronos. By this stage in the cosmic story, the family conflict escalates into a full-blown war. Nonetheless, the main theme remains that of a father facing off against his son:

καὶ τοὺς μὲν κατέπινε μέγας Κρόνος, ὥς τις ἕκαστος
νηδύος ἐξ ἱερῆς μητρὸς πρὸς γούναθ᾽ ἵκοιτο,
τὰ φρονέων, ἵνα μή τις ἀγαυῶν Οὐρανιώνων
ἄλλος ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔχοι βασιληίδα τιμήν.
πεύθετο γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
οὕνεκά οἱ πέπρωτο ἐῷ ὑπὸ παιδὶ δαμῆναι
καὶ κρατερῷ περ ἐόντι, Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλάς:

And great Kronos swallowed them down, each one in turn,
as they came out of the holy womb of their mother and onto her knees.
His plan was that no one else among the brilliant Uranians
should have the royal prerogative among the gods.
For he had learned from Earth and starry Sky
that it was fated he would be defeated by his own son,
mighty though he was, through the plans of great Zeus.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 459-65

As is often the case in Greek epic, the workings of fate indicate the underlying logic of the story.[16] Kronos knows that he must fear his son even before any of his sons are born. To say that this was fated is tantamount to saying that cosmogony, in Hesiod, *had* to be a story of father-son conflict. The same idea recurs in the next generation:

ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ ἄρ᾽ ἔμελλε θεὰν γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην
τέξεσθαι, τότ᾽ ἔπειτα δόλῳ φρένας ἐξαπατήσας
αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν ἐὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδὺν
Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος.
τὼς γάρ οἱ φρασάτην, ἵνα μὴ βασιληίδα τιμὴν
ἄλλος ἔχοι Διὸς ἀντὶ θεῶν αἰειγενετάων.
ἐκ γὰρ τῆς εἵμαρτο περίφρονα τέκνα γενέσθαι·
πρώτην μὲν κούρην γλαυκώπιδα Τριτογένειαν
ἶσον ἔχουσαν πατρὶ μένος καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν.
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ᾽ ἄρα παῖδα θεῶν βασιλῆα καὶ ἀνδρῶν
ἤμελλεν τέξεσθαι, ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντα·
ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα μιν Ζεὺς πρόσθεν ἐὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν,
ὡς δή οἱ φράσσαιτο θεὰ ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε.

But when she was about to give birth to the bright-eyed goddess Athena,
he deceived her, and tricking her
with enticing words put her inside his belly,
on the advice of Earth and starry Sky.
For thus had they advised him, lest someone else
of the eternal gods have the royal prerogative instead of Zeus.
For it was fated that Metis would bear resourceful children:
first the maiden, bright-eyed Tritogeneia,
who has a spirit equal to her father's, and a resourceful mind.
But then she would bear a son, the new king of gods and men,
one with an overpowering heart.
But Zeus first put the goddess in his belly,
so that she might counsel him on good and bad.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 888-900

This time the challenger remains unborn and unnamed: all we are told is that, if allowed to be born, Zeus' son would have deposed his father. Hesiod comes close here to formulating an abstract law of cosmogony: power struggles among the gods are ultimately a matter not of personal ambition, or revenge (though both play a part in his story). What matters, rather, is the pattern of family dysfunction that is handed down through the generations, until fathers learn how to keep the younger generation in check.

What I have argued so far is, of course, not new: thanks to the work of Detienne, Vernant and Clay in particular, the sources of conflict in Hesiod's *Theogony* are now well understood.[17] Indeed, the Hesiodic story has become so familiar to modern readers that it is easy to forget just how peculiar an interpretation of the succession myth it involves. A comparison with other texts can be helpful here, for it shows that the same basic ideas could be arranged in very different ways. For example, the *Theogony* goes further in aligning dynastic struggle with generational conflict than the Hittite text variously known as *Song of Kingship in Heaven, Song of Kumarbi, Song of Going Forth* or *Song of Birth*.[18] Whereas that text depicts the challengers of the present king of the gods as high-ranking officers at his court,[19] the claim to the throne of Kronos and Zeus rests solely on the fact that they are the ruling god's sons.

Family relations are also to the fore in *Enūma eliš*: here too cosmogony starts with a family at odds with itself, or more precisely, with a father turning on his children (I.25-46). At this early stage in the narrative, the primordial 'begetter' Apsû (I.3) propels the narrative forward, and precipitates the first round of conflict. So far so familiar; yet, in *Enūma eliš* conflict in the family does not pass down the generations – in fact, this text tries hard to contain it near the beginning of time. *Enūma eliš* does not replicate the initial conflict between a father and his descendants in an analogous clash one generation later, but rather shifts attention to the mother and her offspring. He motivates this lateral shift partly by drawing a distinction between the primordial couple and the (rest of the) gods. Apsû and Tiāmat are introduced into the narrative at a time 'when none of the gods were yet in existence' (*enūma ilāni lā šūpû manāma, E.e.* I.7): the point is never spelled out, but the implication must surely be that Apsû and Tiāmat are, in important ways, not proper gods, but rather *sui*

*generis*.[20] Last but not least, the poet of *Enūma eliš* obscures the male line of succession, which is so central to proceedings in the *Theogony*: between Apsû, the original father, and Marduk, the ultimate son, we find a proliferation of powerful male figures who effectively neutralise each other until Marduk takes over.

When Apsû first turns on his children at the beginning of *Enūma eliš*, he voices his complaints to Tiāmat:

*apsû pa-a-šu i-pu-šam-*[*ma*]
*a-na ti-amat el-le-tam-ma i-zak-kar-ši*
*im-*[*ta*]*r-ṣa-am-ma al-kàt-su-nu e-li-ia*
*ur-ri-iš la šu-up-šu-ha-ku mu-ši-iš la ṣa-al-la-ku*
*lu-uš-hal-liq-ma al-kàt-su-nu lu-sa-ap-pi-ih*
*qu-lu liš-šá-kin-ma i ni-iṣ-lal ni-i-ni*

Apsû opened his mouth
and spoke to pure(?) Tiāmat:
'Their behaviour is distressing to me,
during the day I do not find rest, at night I cannot sleep;
Let me destroy their ways and scatter them:
let there be silence so that we can sleep!'

*Enūma eliš* I.35-40

What Apsû suggests here is effectively a return to primordial chaos, an 'evil' plan, as the narrator calls it (Akk. *lemnēti ikpud*, I.52). Initially, Tiāmat shares the narrator's view (*lemutta ittadi ana karšīša* I.44), and resists Apsû's proposal. However, shocked by the loss of her partner, she later strays from the path of good judgment (*i nišdud ṭābiš*, I.46) and embraces the evil that Apsû promoted (*ahrataš eli Apsî ulammin Tiāmat*, II.3). Indeed, she goes further: whereas Apsû had merely proposed to undo what he and Tiāmat had created, Tiāmat sets in train an elaborate counter-cosmogony, complete with monsters, gender inversion and, more generally, a perverted set of values. At I.125, the 'evil' plotting of an unspecified group of rebel gods (cf. *iktapdū ... lemutta*, I.111) seems 'good' to her (*amātum iṭīb elša*), and this revaluation culminates in her handing the tablet of destinies to her new lover Qingu, a gesture that

recalls the theft of the same tablet, and attendant breakdown of cosmic order, in the *Epic of Anzu*.[21]

At *Enūma eliš* II.3 the narrator summarily characterises Tiāmat's activities as 'evil' (Akk. *ulammin*), and from then on treats her as the main obstacle to Marduk's rule and cosmic stability. At the end of the text, he concludes:

*i-n*[*a-an-n*]*a-ma za-ma-ru šá* $^{d}$*marūtuk*
[*šá*] *ti-*[*amat*] *ik-mu-ma il-qu-u šar-ru-ti*

Now this is the song of Marduk,
[who] defeated Tiāmat and took kingship.[22]

*Enūma eliš* VII.161-2

Acquiring kingship, in *Enūma eliš,* means defeating Tiāmat, 'the woman' (I.144). There seems to be no particular interest in a succession of male rulers.

In practice, things are more complicated, for there are several powerful males with competing claims to the throne. Ellil, the traditional ruler of the Mesopotamian pantheon, is almost entirely written out of the particular story told in *Enūma eliš*.[23] That, however, still leaves Anšar, Anu and Ea, Marduk's great-grandfather, grandfather and father respectively. Anšar, as the oldest of the three, co-ordinates the resistance against Tiāmat (Tablet II), thus leading Lambert to declare him Marduk's predecessor as king of the gods.[24] Anšar, however, is no king. He is never formally enthroned and never acquires 'kingship' (Akk *šarrūtu*). It is true that he is called 'king' at one point in the text, but significantly it is Marduk who calls him thus when addressing Tiāmat:

*a-na an-šár šàr ilāni lem-né-e-ti te-eš-e-ma*
*ù a-na ilāni abbē*$^{e}$*-a le-mut-ta-ki tuk-tin-ni*

'You have plotted evil against Anšar, king of the gods,
and set your wickedness against the gods my fathers.' [25]

*Enūma eliš* IV.83-4

Marduk's words are part of an angry and highly rhetorical speech: they are transparently designed to legitimate violence, and must not be taken as straightforward statements of fact. The narrator himself does not call Anšar a king, and Marduk never does so again. Nor does Anšar behave like a king: he does not confront either Apsû or Tiāmat and must defer to other gods in all important matters, for example when appointing Marduk as their champion (Tablet III). Anšar's son Anu has arguably a stronger claim to the title of divine ruler. His power matters a great deal in *Enūma eliš*: it is what the usurper Qingu appropriates at the start of his rebellion (Akk. *anūtu* at I.159, cf. IV.82, etc.), and what Marduk acquires in the course of suppressing it (IV.4, VII.102). Marduk in turn gifts Anu the tablet of destinies after his victory over Tiāmat (V.69-70), in what amounts to a striking gesture of deference.[26] Throughout the poem, Anu acts as the patron of Marduk: in Tablet I he gives him the winds which set him on a collision course with Tiāmat; and in Tablet VI he enthrones the bow star as the ultimate symbol of Marduk's supremacy.[27] Anu is even present at Marduk's birth: we hear that he 'exulted and smiled' at the new-born god (I.90), and that he 'rendered him perfect', as if he was in fact his father (I.91).

But of course Anu is not Marduk's father: that honour goes to Ea, who would have been the most obvious intermediate figure in a three-stage succession of male rulers. Not only does he defeat the original father Apsû and take his crown (I.67), but he is also introduced as 'having authority over his fathers' (Akk. *šālissunu* I.17, on the significance of the plural see below), and being 'without rival' among his peers (I.20). Taken in context, this suggests some unresolved tension between Ea and his powerful father Anu:

*ur-ri-ku ūmu*$^{meš}$ *uş-şi-bu šanāti*(mu-an-na)$^{meš}$
$^{d}$*a-num a-pil-šu-nu šá-nin abbē-šú*
*an-šár* $^{d}$*a-num bu-uk-ra-šu ú-maš-šil-ma*
*ù* $^{d}$*a-num tam-ši-la-šú ú-lid* $^{d}$*nu-dím-mud*
$^{d}$*nu-dím-mud šá abbē -šú šá-liţ-su-nu šu-ma*
*pal-ka uz-nu ha-sis e-mu-qan pu-un-gul*
*gu-uš-šur ma-'-diš a-na a-lid abī-šú an-šár*
*la i-ši ša-ni-na ina ilāni*$^{meš}$ *at-he-e-šú*

They increased the days and added to the years.
Their first-born Anu rivalled his fathers.
Anšar made his son Anu like himself,
and Anu bore Nudimmud (i.e. Ea) in his own likeness.
Nudimmud had authority over his fathers.
He had profound understanding and powerful strength,
he was much more powerful than his father's father Anšar,
and had no rival among the gods, his peers.

*Enūma eliš* I.13-20

There is much in these lines that invites comparison of Ea and his father Anu: they resemble each other (I.16), and stand out among the gods. The Akkadian verb *šanānu*, 'rival', is commonly used in Akkadian to express power differentials, as for example when a king is said to have no rival.[28] But the verb is not common in *Enūma eliš*: Marduk is twice said to be 'unrivalled' (IV.4 and 6, VI.106), otherwise *šanānu* is only used of Anu and Ea in the passage quoted above. We may note the implied trajectory: Anu rivals his fathers (I.14); Ea has no rival among his peers (I.20); and the gods declare Marduk's power to be unrivalled (VI.106). From Anu to Ea to Marduk, grandfather to father to son, the central theme of the succession myth lurks just beneath the surface. My point, however, is that it is not allowed to emerge: although there is a clear sense that Ea supersedes Anu, and Marduk ousts Ea, the narrator never allows conflict among these gods to come to the fore. Indeed, he systematically defuses tensions among them.

One of his favourite strategies for doing so is to obscure the precise family relationships between these gods. In the passage quoted above, the plural 'fathers' (*abbū*, I.14 and 17) precludes any direct comparison between a physical father and his son. The closest we come to acknowledging generational tension is when Ea is compared, not to his father, but to 'his father's father' Anšar, in many ways a convenient substitute for Anu.[29] The passage concludes by singling Ea out 'among the gods, his peers', of whom we have so far heard nothing, and who remain largely anonymous in the narrative. With attention shifting from fathers to peers, the narrator safely sidesteps the pattern of succession.

Another way in which *Enūma eliš* obscures the theme of male succession is by focusing on gender conflict and calling into doubt Anu's and Ea's masculinity. We are again invited to compare them in the central episode where the gods look for a champion to take on Tiāmat. Anšar, who acts as trustee of the divine cause, first turns to Ea. When his first champion is defeated, he approaches Anu,[30] but he also fails.[31] Anšar then comes back to Ea, who finally settles the matter by recruiting his son Marduk. Anšar promises to install Marduk as king of the gods if he succeeds in defeating Tiāmat. To sanction the agreement, he sends for the other gods, and in this connection summarises his efforts to find a champion:

*áš-pur-ma* $^{d}$*a-num ul i-le-'-a ma-har-šá*
$^{d}$*nu-dím-mud i-dur-ma i-tu-ra ár-kiš*
*i'-ir* $^{d}$*marūtuk apkal ilāni ma-ru-ku-un*
*ma-ha-riš ti-amat lib-ba-šú a-ra ub-la*

I sent Anu but he could not resist Tiāmat.
Nudimmud (i.e. Ea) too took fright and turned back.
Now Marduk has come forward, the sage among the gods, your (pl.) son:
his heart compelled him to march against Tiāmat.

*Enūma eliš* III.53-7 = 111-14

What we have here reads like a summary of the Mediterranean succession myth, with Sky and his descendants taking turns at leading the gods.[32] But since Anu and Ea are defeated outright, they are in no position to mount a challenge. Indeed, defeat at the hands of Tiāmat decisively compromises their male prerogative: as they themselves point out, she is only a woman (Akk. *sinništu*), and should not prevail against males (II.92 = 116). Humiliated and emasculated, all that remains for Anu and Ea is to endorse Marduk's rise to power.[33] That process reaches its climax when Marduk's physical father Ea surrenders his name to him. Traditionally, Marduk and Ea get on,[34] but in *Enūma eliš* matters are complicated by the fact that Marduk supplants his father, in more than one sense. In Tablet VI he takes charge of human creation, the domain of Ea, as the creator god of Mesopotamian tradition.[35] And in Tablet VII, he takes over Ea's very identity, and with it his powers:

*zik-ri* $^{d}$*í-gì-gì im-bu-u na-gab-šú-un*
*iš-me-e-ma* $^{d}$*é-a ka-bat-ta-šu it-ta-an-gi*
*ma-a ša ab-bé-*[*e*]*-šu ú-šar-ri-hu zi-kir-šu*
*šu-ú ki-ma ia-a-ti-ma* $^{d}$*é-a lu-ú šum-šu*
*ri-kis par-şi-ia ka-li-šu-nu li-bel-ma*
*gim-ri te-re-e-ti-ia šu-ú li-it-ta-bal*
*i-na zik-ri ha-an-ša-a ilāni rabûti*
*ha-an-ša-a šu-mé-e-šu im-bu-ú ú-šá-ti-ru al-kàt-su*

The names which all the Igigi called (Marduk) –
Ea heard them and his heart became very pleased:
'Now that his fathers have glorified his name
let him also be called Ea, like myself!
Let him rule over all my rites
and administer all my offices/decrees!'
With fifty appellations the great gods
pronounced (Marduk's) fifty names and exalted his position.

*Enūma eliš* VII.137-44

In this climactic passage at the end of the poem, Ea gifts Marduk his cults (Akk. *parşū*), his position (*têrētu*), and even his name (*šumu*). Establishing a name (*šuma šakānu*) was a crucial measure of status in Mesopotamian culture, and in *Enūma eliš* names have cosmic significance.[36] In effect, Ea here hands over to Marduk his own very identity as a god. Babylonian religious thought could be flexible, but this gesture stands out, both for the completeness of Ea's surrender and for the text's insistence that he acted entirely out of his own free will. The plausibility of this claim rests in large measure on the fact that the issue of fatherhood has been kept in delicate suspense throughout the poem. In this text about fathers, we have become so used to Marduk 'the son',[37] acting on behalf of 'the gods his fathers',[38] that even the ultimate moment of crisis, that moment in the history of kingship in heaven when the ruling god succeeds his father, can be portrayed as a matter of consensus, a general taking over from various consenting fathers.

## CLOSURE

Conflict among the gods is configured differently in the *Theogony* and *Enūma eliš*. Both texts begin with a clash between fathers and their offspring, but while the *Theogony* develops paternal aggression into a cosmogonic *leitmotif*, *Enūma eliš* transfers the potential for conflict from father to mother, and creates a power vacuum among the remaining male gods which is filled by Marduk. Comparing these different approaches can help to defamiliarise the Hesiodic story: although the potential for conflict between a father and his children is familiar in both the Babylonian and the Greek context, only Hesiod carries the theme across from one generation to the next.[39] In keeping with the broader aims of this volume, I ask what this difference reveals about the poetics of each text. I am particularly interested here in how cosmic narratives reach a sense of closure.

The Hesiodic picture will be familiar to most readers of this volume: after the younger gods have vanquished the Titans, Zeus goes on to defeat Typhoeus, and closure is finally reached toward the end of the text:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσσαν,
Τιτήνεσσι δὲ τιμάων κρίναντο βίηφι,
δή ῥα τότ᾽ ὦτρυνον βασιλευέμεν ἠδὲ ἀνάσσειν
Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν
885 ἀθανάτων· ὁ δὲ τοῖσιν ἐὺ διεδάσσατο τιμάς.

When the blessed gods had brought their toil to completion
and had forcibly settled the issue of their status with the Titans,
then they urged on Earth's advice that Olympian Zeus who sees afar
should be king and ruler
885 over the immortals; and he allotted them their privileges well.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 881-5

This is one of only a handful of passages in the *Theogony* where 'the gods' as a group act in concord,[40] and it marks a formal conclusion to the theme of strife that has so far

propelled the story forward. Important here is the language of *telos* (ἐξετέλεσσαν) which in early Greek epic signals closure at the level of text as well as plot. We may think of the plan of Zeus in the *Iliad*, Διὸς δ'ἐτελείετο βουλή, or the τέλος of homecoming which marks the end of the *Odyssey*, such as it is.[41] Hesiod prepares his audience for closure: in line 638, the *telos* of the Titanomachy is still in the balance (ἶσον δὲ τέλος τέτατο πτολέμοιο).[42]

Still, the passage quoted above signals more than just the end of a particular war. Much hinges on how we translate πόνος in line 881. Aristarchus thought that in Homer it meant 'work' (especially 'work of war'), with no value judgment implied.[43] But this is not Homer and, in any case, Aristarchus was wrong: even in Homer, and certainly here, πόνος means toil, and specifically the toil that arises from armed conflict.[44] Only without 'toil' can the gods of epic become 'blessed', μάκαρες, as they should be. Hesiod freely uses μάκαρ of the gods in the *Works and Days* and in the proem to the *Theogony*,[45] but he generally avoids it in the main narrative of the *Theogony* (v. 128 is only an apparent exception). At the moment when conflict gives way to consensus, he suddenly introduces it – and to powerful effect. The result is almost a resumé of the *Theogony* (with πόνος θεῶν functioning as a quasi-generic tag), and a definition of what it is to be a god. Being divine means being without toil: this insight pervades Greek epic, where the gods are ἀκήδεες, ῥεῖα ζῶντες, etc.[46] Hesiod tells us how they came to be that way.

In other ways too the world of the gods acquires its final shape in the passage quoted above: Zeus is appointed king and distributes the τιμαί well. The standard translation 'honours' does not quite capture what is at issue here: τιμή expresses due recognition of the order of things, as expressed in the appropriate distribution of status and wealth in society.[47] This is particularly important when it comes to the gods: τιμή is what makes them who they are but also what keeps them happy. In the *Theogony* proem, Hesiod hinted twice that his narrative was going to culminate in the proper distribution of τιμαί to the gods (73-4; 111-13). Until then, they fight over their status, just as, more generally, τιμή is a major cause of conflict among the gods and heroes of epic. In the *Hymn to Demeter*, for example, the narrative reaches closure only after the τιμαί of the gods are settled.[48] We are led to expect a similar settlement in the *Theogony* – but the story continues after the distribution of honours with further genealogical developments:

Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεὺς πρώτην ἄλοχον θέτο Μῆτιν

Zeus, as king of the gods, made Metis his first wife.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 886

West argues that this line, and the episode that follows, 'puts a stop to the chain of revolutions'.[49] At one level he is right: with Metis on his side (or rather in his bowels), Zeus will not be deposed.[50] However, the Metis episode also re-opens a text that has already reached closure: πρώτην ἄλοχον promises a series of further wives, and with the wives and their children comes the potential for renewed generational discord. Metis herself is dangerous and needs to be swallowed. Hera, who concludes the catalogue of Zeus' wives, is so enraged when her husband gives birth to Athena out of his own head that she in turn bears Hephaestus – not the most fearsome of gods, perhaps, but a token of discord nonetheless:

Ἥρη δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτὸν οὐ φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
γείνατο, καὶ ζαμένησε καὶ ἤρισε ᾧ παρακοίτῃ,
ἐκ πάντων τέχνῃσι κεκασμένον Οὐρανιώνων.

Hera bore famous Hephaestus not by making love,
but was angry with her husband and quarreled with him –
Hephaestus who excels all Uranian gods in craft.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 927-9

With consensus among the gods becoming a distant memory, the narrative gathers momentum: there follow more divine births, which in turn give way to mixed pairings between goddesses and mortals. And there follows an even longer list of matings between male gods and human females, which was known under a separate title in antiquity, the *Catalogue of Women*.[51] Fully 8,000 lines of divine-human matings later, that text culminates in an account of the Trojan War as the conflict among gods and humans *par excellence*.[52] The *Theogony*, then, negotiates the moment of closure in the cosmic story – that moment when the gods complete their toil and find peace – by

opening the genealogical floodgates: one wife leads on to more wives, more births, more conflicts, until we end up with the most devastating of all conflicts in Greek epic, the Trojan War.

What I have argued last has poetic implications, which a comparative perspective can help draw out. Not unlike the *Theogony*, the Babylonian *Enūma eliš* takes us from strife to consensus among the gods, but while the end of the *Theogony* launches into extensive catalogues of divine and human matings, *Enūma eliš* offers us the first audience with King Marduk.[53] The scene culminates in the gods solemnly pronouncing Marduk's fifty throne names.[54] Those names express his prerogatives, but above all celebrate the consensual nature of the settlement that has been reached, the text confers on Marduk a wealth of divine powers which in other contexts might be thought to exist independently of him. Whereas the *Theogony* accelerates away from consensus and closure towards the end of its cosmic story, Tablet VII of *Enūma eliš* reaches a point of perfect *stasis*.

*Enūma eliš*, it has often been pointed out, aggressively reconfigures Mesopotamian cosmogonic thought, overwriting competing texts in the process.[55] The aim, it seems, is to eclipse alternative stories, rather than encourage supplementary reading.[56] Marduk's failure to take a wife is symptomatic in this regard: his spouse Zarpānītum was important in Babylonian tradition but does not feature in *Enūma eliš*. Without a wife, and without children, Marduk remains the perennial son of 'the gods his fathers', as *Enūma eliš* has it.[57] Equally telling is the text's account of how Marduk founded Babylon: in the Babylonian *Poem of the Flood*, or *Atra-hasīs*, the gods are made to work the land for the ruling deity Ellil. They rebel, and Ellil is forced to create man in order to relieve them of their labour.[58] *Enūma eliš* keeps the main elements of the story but re-arranges them: here, Marduk first creates mankind to free the gods of any toil, and is *then* rewarded by his grateful peers with the building of Babylon.[59] Toil there is in both cases. But in *Enūma eliš* everything happens by consensus, and with reference to Marduk's city of Babylon: there is no room left for conflict, and there are no further stories to be told beyond what we are given in this text. Even the most central of Babylonian mythological narratives, the story of the great flood, is sidelined.

*Enūma eliš*, then, keeps other mythological traditions firmly at bay. We are not encouraged to ask what happened after Marduk's victory – indeed we are presented with the end of narrative, and the beginning of worship. Hesiod keeps his

text much more open to other stories. Consider the concluding catalogues of the *Theogony*, which propel us into the heroic era: their main function seems to consist, precisely, in linking the myth of succession to the main body of Greek heroic epic. In other ways too, Hesiodic narrative leans toward heroic epic. At the end of the *Theogony*, in the form it has reached us, we hear of Achilles, Aeneas and Odysseus (1006-13). A related strategy is foreshadowing: mention of Bellerophontes and Perseus, for example, alludes to the era of the demigods.[60] The story of Heracles, in book 5 of the *Catalogue of Women*, moves all the way down from cosmic beginnings to the Trojan War.[61] In all these cases, we are encouraged to look ahead to the next chapter in divine history. Hesiod's *Theogony* deliberately draws heroic epic into its ambit – and that means, also, that conflict among the gods must continue after the end of succession in heaven.

Hesiod's most striking refusal to close off the cosmogonic story comes precisely at the point where conflict among the gods ceases and closure seems imminent: Zeus has been appointed king (*Theogony* 883), against the pull of Homeric epic, where he is never called 'king of the gods', θεῶν βασιλεύς, but rather πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, 'father of gods and men'.[62] Hesiod aligns himself with the genealogical emphasis we find in Homer: Zeus certainly does get to father rather a lot of gods and – in the *Catalogue of Women* – also men. In the *Theogony*, as in other Near Eastern cosmogonies, he had to become king first: the order of the universe, and the structure of the narrative both depend upon it. Hesiod reconciles these two demands by re-interpreting the role of the divine king in genealogical terms. I quote again the crucial line:[63]

> Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεὺς πρώτην ἄλοχον θέτο Μῆτιν
>
> Zeus, as king of the gods, made Metis his first wife.
>
> Hesiod, *Theogony* 886

At this pivotal point in the narraive, kingship becomes a matter of taking a wife. The world is made up of families in Greek epic, which is ultimately why father must clash with son in the *Theogony*, and why king Zeus can think of nothing better to do than take wives and father more children.[64] This is, moreover, the reason why the end of

the *Theogony* as it has come down to us cannot be dismissed as an artificial attempt to forge a transition to the *Catalogue of Women*. Editors have sometimes bracketed the concluding catalogues that link the *Theogony* to the *Catalogue of Women*, roughly lines 930-1020 of the transmitted text.[65] We are not likely ever to know for certain when the *Theogony* acquired its present shape – but whenever that happened, and whoever was responsible, the result makes sense. For the openness of the *Theogony*, its refusal to close off the cosmogonic story, is rooted in the logic of the story it tells: if kingship in heaven is configured essentially as a family matter, and if enlarging the divine family is Zeus' main focus as king – then the story of how he became ruler of the gods cannot simply stop with his accession to power.[66]

Like the editors of Hesiod, readers of *Enūma eliš* have also taken issue with the ending of the poem. They point out that the concluding catalogue of Marduk's fifty names contradicts the story in certain details; and that, more generally, it is a product of Mesopotamian *Listenwissenschaft*: divine names were a favourite topic, and the list of Marduk's fifty names in *Enūma eliš* grows directly out of this tradition.[67] Some scholars have, on these grounds, claimed that the list was grafted onto the epic some time after it was composed.[68] More recently, Andrea Seri has argued that an existing list must have been incorporated into the epic at the time of its composition, and that it was from the start an integral part of this text.[69] As Seri shows, the issue of naming is a driving force behind the story of *Enūma elish* ever since Tablet I. Names encapsulate order in this poem, and Marduk monopolises names after becoming king just as he monopolises most other sources of power.

The concluding catalogue of Marduk's names, then, cannot be divorced from the main body of the poem, any more than the concluding catalogues of the *Theogony* can be removed by the drastic use of square brackets: both passages grow out of the story of divine succession, as these texts tell it. Nonetheless, the difficulties they have caused for the modern reader should not be brushed aside too quickly. I started this chapter by arguing that the myth of succession offered a shared template for cosmogonic storytelling across the ancient Near East, and that both the *Theogony* and *Enūma eliš* used it to tell their story of how the world came to be. At the same time, I insisted that we take seriously the culturally specific character of our texts, and their contexts of performance and reception. The urgency of this task is apparent when we reach the end of *Enūma eliš* and the *Theogony*, for it is at the end of these two texts, when cosmogony releases us into the world as we know it, that local context exerts its

strongest influence. In the case of Hesiod's *Theogony*, the influence of heroic epic is most important. The proliferation of genealogies toward the end of the *Theogony*, and the thinning of the poetic fabric it entails suggests that the priority is no longer that of telling the story of kingship in heaven, but of anchoring that well known and widely shared story in a tradition of epic that shapes the *Theogony*'s dominant context of performance and reception.

We see a similar process of pulling away from cross-cultural narrative patterns at the end of *Enūma eliš*. Here, the concluding list of Marduk's fifty names nudges us towards Babylonian theological scholarship, and its learned practitioners. As has often been pointed out, the list is Babylonian theological speculation in action: it does not just honour Marduk, but also offers its own etymologizing exegesis.[70] This is *Listenwissenschaft* as ritual drama, a founding performance of Babylonian scholarly practice that comes complete with its own instructions for future use.[71] Not all the details of the text are clear, but it transpires that the well-being of 'the land' (VII.149-50), depends on successful exegesis of Marduk's names ('a leading figure should expound them', VII.145), discussion ('the wise and learned should confer about them', VII.146) and transmission (father to son, teacher to 'shepherd and herdsman', VII.147-8). In these concluding instructions, there is an effort to fast-forward to the present, an effort that is just as specific and sustained as the catalogues at the end of Hesiod's *Theogony*. The goal, however, is different: what completes the cosmogonic story in the *Theogony* is heroic epic. The *Enūma eliš*, by contrast, finds its culmination in the Babylonian cult of Marduk, and the scholarship that attends to it.[72]

## CONCLUSION

Conflict and consensus play an important role in ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern cosmogonies. Broadly speaking, the universe develops from one to the other: the cosmic story closes when consensus is achieved among the gods, a process that is configured specifically as the enthronement of a legitimate king in heaven. That rather broad-brush picture, however, elides important differences in the detail. I have argued that the *Theogony* interprets succession as a matter of son replacing father, whereas the Babylonian *Enūma eliš* plays down father-son competition after the initial conflict with Apsû. These thematic choices have important poetic corollaries. *Enūma eliš* goes to extreme lengths in order to establish consensus and closure: other texts are

aggressively side-lined; when Marduk becomes king, narrative stops and worship begins. There are no further stories to be told. By contrast, the *Theogony* opens out the cosmic story toward heroic epic and the much later climax of the Trojan War. For the purposes of cosmogony, we need a king, but once we have him, Zeus' role turns out to be primarily that of making the divine family tree expand, so that the semidivine heroes may be born. There is scope for new conflicts – and, above all, there is scope for more narrative. The *Theogony*, we might say, takes ancient Mediterranean cosmogony, and establishes its connections to heroic epic. *Enūma eliš*, by contrast, adapts the same genres to Babylonian cult and its associated traditions of learning: total consensus paves the way for worship. That is in fact how the poem was read: *Enūma eliš* formed part of the most important Babylonian state ritual, the annual New Year's festival or *akītu*. By contrast, the *Theogony* was performed in the same contexts as Homeric epic. It comes as no surprise, of course, that each of our texts reflects its cultural and performative context. What I hope to have shown is that, when we read them in a comparative framework, we become more attuned to some of the *Theogony*'s most striking features, such as its interest in father-son conflict, its reinterpretation of kingship as fatherhood, and above all, its refusal to stop.

## WORKS CITED

Bachvarova, M. R. (2013) Translation of the Song of Birth in *Gods, Heroes, and Monsters: A Sourcebook of Greek, Roman, and Near Eastern Myths in Translation*, ed. C. López-Ruiz. New York and Oxford: 140-4.

Bottéro, J. and Kramer, S. N. (1993) *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme. Mythologie mésopotamienne*, 2nd edn. Paris.

Strauss Clay, J. (1981-2) 'Immortal and ageless forever', *CJ* 66: 112-17.

--- (1989) *The Politics of Olympus*. Princeton.

--- (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.

Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.-P. (1978) *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, trans. J. Lloyd. Chicago.

Domínguez, C., Saussy, H. and Villanueva, D. (2015) *Introducing Comparative Literature: New Trends and Applications*. London.

Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic*. London.

Haubold, J. (2005) ‘Heracles in the Hesiodic “Catalogue of Women”’, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, ed. R. Hunter. Cambridge: 85-98.

--- (2013) *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature.* Cambridge.

Hilgert, M. (2009) ‘Von “Listenwissenschaft” und “epistemischen Dingen”: Konzeptuelle Annäherungen an altorientalische Wissenspraktiken’, *Journal for General Philosophy of Science* 40: 277-309.

Hirschberger, M. (2004) *Gynaikon Katalogos und Megalai Ehoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen*. Munich and Leipzig.

Hoffner, H. A. Jr. (1975) ‘Hittite mythological texts: a survey’, in *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*, eds. H. Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts, Baltimore: 136-45.

--- (1998) *Hittite Myths*, 2nd edn. Atlanta.

Hunter, R. (2005) (ed.) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge.

Kämmerer, T. R. and Metzler, K. A. (2012) *Das babylonische Weltschöpfungsepos Enūma elîš*. Münster.

Katz, D. (2011) ‘Reconstructing Babylon: recycling mythological traditions toward a new theology’, in *Babylon. Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*, eds. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, M. Van Ess and J. Marzahn. Berlin and Boston: 123-34.

Kelly, A. (2008) ‘The Babylonian captivity of Homer: the case of the Dios Apate’, *Rheinisches Museum* 151: 259-304.

Lambert, W. G. (2013) *Babylonian Creation Myths*. Winona Lake.

Lehrs, K. (1882) *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*, 3rd edn. Leipzig.

López-Ruiz, C. (2010) *When the Gods were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East*. Cambridge, Mass.

Machinist, P. (2005). Order and disorder: some Mesopotamian reflections’, in *Genesis and Regeneration: Essays on Conceptions of Origins*, ed. S. Shaked. Jerusalem: 31-61.

Michalowski, P. (1990) ‘Presence at the creation’, in *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honour of William Moran*, eds. T. Abush et al. Atlanta: 381-96.

Morrison, J. V. (1992) ‘Alternatives to the epic tradition: Homer’s challenges in the “Iliad”’, *TAPhA* 122: 61-71.

Myerston, J. (2013) ‘Divine names in the Derveni papyrus and Mesopotamian hermeneutics’, *Trends in Classics* 5: 74-110.

Ormand, K. (2014) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women and Archaic Greece*. Cambridge.

Richter, S. L. (2002) *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: lešakkēn šemô šām in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Berlin and New York.

Rutherford, I. (2009) ‘Hesiod and the literary tradition of the Near East’, in *Brill’s Companion to Hesiod*, eds. F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis. Leiden: 9-36.

Scodel, R. (2008) *Epic Facework: Self-Presentation and Social Interaction in Homer*. Swansea.

Sedley, D. (2010) ‘Hesiod’s “Theogony” and Plato’s “Timaeus”’, in *Plato and Hesiod*, eds. G. R. Boys-Stones and J. H. Haubold. Oxford: 246-58.

Seri, A. (2006) ‘The fifty names of Marduk in “Enūma eliš”’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126: 507-19.

--- (2012) ‘The role of creation in “Enūma eliš”’, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12: 4-29.

--- (2014) ‘Borrowings to create anew: intertextuality in the Babylonian “Poem of Creation” (“Enūma eliš”)’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134: 89-106.

Soden, W. von (1936) ‘Leistung und Grenze sumerischer und babylonischer Wissenschaft’, *Die Welt als Geschichte: Zeitschrift für universalgeschichtliche Forschung* 2: 411-64 and 509-57.

Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (1998) *Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application*. Amsterdam and Atlanta.

van Dongen, E. (2011)‘The “kingship in heaven”-theme of the Hesiodic “Theogony”: origin, function, composition’, *GRBS* 51: 180-201.

Walcot, P. (1966) *Hesiod and the Near East.* Cardiff.

West, M. L. (1966) *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.

--- (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Oxford.

--- (1997) *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.

Wisnom, L. S. (2014). *Intertextuality in Babylonian narrative poetry: Anzû, Enūma Elish, and Erra and Ishum.* DPhil. University of Oxford.

[1] See Haubold 2013, ch. 1.

[2] The so-called 'argument by exclusion', which stipulates that a parallel is the more telling the less it makes sense in its immediate context, has done particular damage here; for a good discussion see Kelly 2008.

[3] For this principle see Domínguez, Saussy and Villanueva 2015.

[4] López-Ruiz 2010 collects and discusses the relevant material.

[5] As Tötösy de Zepetnek 1998: 15 puts it, 'the first general principle of comparative literature is the postulate that ... it is not the "what" but rather the "how" that is of importance'.

[6] This is not to say that other comparisons are less valuable on their own terms; for a recent reading of the *Theogony* and the Hittite *Song of Going Forth* (= *Kingship in Heaven/Song of Kumarbi*) which is attentive to the poetic form and narrative choices of both texts see van Dongen 2011.

[7] As is evident from Hesiod's own précis at *Th.* 11-21 (esp. ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος at v. 21) – though there is also a sense that the very oldest creatures are not quite gods like the others: see *Th.* 45-6, 105-6 and especially 108 (θεοὶ καὶ γαῖα). On Chaos as a god, see Sedley 2010: 250.

[8] Discussion and documentation in Walcot 1966; West 1966: 18-31; West 1997: 276-86; Rutherford 2009; López-Ruiz 2010; van Dongen 2011, with further literature.

[9] Seri 2012: 10 makes the point that the last three generations of gods in *Enūma eliš*, Anu – Ea – Marduk, are clearly demarcated from their ancestors.

[10] Haubold 2013: 53.

[11] For detailed comparison of Greek and non-Greek texts see the literature cited above, n. 8. Lambert 2013: 417-26 discusses connections between the Hittite *Kingship in Heaven* and Mesopotamian cosmogonic thought.

[12] The text is slightly unclear on whether Anšar is a son of Apsû or of the second-generation god Lahmu. Eudemus of Rhodes opts for the former interpretation and is followed by Seri 2012: 9 and Lambert 2013: 423. Anu would then be a grandson of Apsû.

[13] All translations in this chapter are my own.

[14] Κρονίων and Κρονίδης are attested a total of nine times in the *Theogony*. Passages like Hes. *Th.* 660 (Κρόνου υἱέ) confirm that the force of the patronymic was certainly felt.

[15] Kronos takes up the similar rhetoric of Gaia's speech at Hes. *Th.* 164-6.

[16] For fate as a way of thinking about plot in early Greek epic see Morrison 1992; Graziosi/Haubold 2005: 84-92.

[17] Detienne and Vernant 1978: 57-106; Clay 2003; van Dongen 2011: 191-3.

[18] Discussion in van Dongen 2011, esp. p. 182 with n. 3, where he considers the title of the text; translation in Hoffner 1998: 42-5, Bachvarova 2013: 140-3.

[19] Hoffner 1975: 138-9 points out that the challengers come from two rival dynasties, Alalu-Kumarbi-Ullikumi and Anu-Teshub.

[20] The epithets *zārûšun* = '*their* (i.e. the gods') begetter' and *muallidat gimrīšun* = '*their* (i.e. the gods') mother' at *E.e.* I.3-4 further suggest that Apsû and Tiāmat stand apart from (the rest of) the gods. Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 14-15 note that the poet hardly ever marks the name 'Tiāmat' as a divine name by prefixing the determinative god sign DINGIR; and that despite being anthropomorphised she retains many of the physical characteristics of sea. Similar points could be made about her spouse Apsû.

[21] Lambert 2013: 451.

[22] *E.e.* VII.161-2.

[23] Wisnom 2014: 140-76. At *E.e.* VII.149, Marduk himself becomes 'the Ellil of the gods'.

[24] Lambert 2013: 448-9.

[25] The gloss *an-šár = šàr ilāni* at *E.e.* IV.83 looks like a play of (false) etymology, of the kind that is common in Tablets VI and VII of the poem: AN.ŠÁR ~ DINGIR ŠÁR ~ *šar* DINGIR(.DINGIR) ~ *šar ilāni*.

[26] In the *Epic of Anzû* the tablet of destinies belongs to Ellil and is returned to him after Ninurta has defeated Anzû: SB *Anzû* III.37-9.

[27] *E.e.* I.105-6; VI.84-94.

[28] E.g. SB *Gilg.* I.45 and often in royal inscriptions. For full documentation see *CAD* s.v.

[29] *E.e.* I.19. Anšar's role in *Enūma eliš* is transparently modelled on Anu's very similar role in the older *Epic of Anzû*.

[30] *E.e.* II.96-102, with intriguing echoes of Anšar's earlier speech to Ea (II.77 ~ 99-100).

[31] For Anšar's hope that his son might prevail where his grandson had failed, see especially line 98 (*ša gapšā emūqāšu*) which echoes Ea's concession speech (v. 87,

*gapšā emūqāša*): Tiāmat's sweeping powers call for the equally sweeping powers of Anu.

[32] The immediate inspiration for the passage comes from the *Epic of Anzû*, Tablet II. But note that the four gods who are mobilised there bear no obvious relation with the Mediterranean succession myth.

[33] At *E.e.* V.67-70, Marduk presents the 'guide ropes' of the world to Ea and the tablet of destiny to Anu. These are major symbols of divine power in Mesopotamian thought, and in different circumstances could have occasioned serious clashes among these gods (as the tablet of destiny does in both the *Epic of Anzû* and elsewhere in *E.e.*). In fact, however, Anu and Ea receive them as indulgences from Marduk.

[34] Lambert 2013: 458 ('there was no conflict between Ea and his son').

[35] On Ea as creator see Bottéro/Kramer 1993: 151-202; for Marduk supplanting him in *Enūma eliš* see Seri 2014: 100-1, Wisnom 2014: 168-73.

[36] For *šuma šakānu* see Richter 2002: 127-206; for the significance of names in *E.e.* see Michalowski 1990: 385, who comments that 'chaos [in this text] is envisaged as an absence and presence is linked to naming'; for detailed discussion of naming in *E.e.* see Seri 2006.

[37] *E.e.* I.102 and VII.127, with word play on Marduk's name (Akk. *Marūtuk*) and Akk. *māru*, 'son'.

[38] Akkadian *abu*, 'father', need not describe a biological relationship, and is in fact used rather loosely in the poem. Akk. *abu* ~ unspecified ancestor: I.14, 17; *abu* ~ great-grandfather (Anšar and Marduk): II.139-54; *abu* ~ grandfather: II.8, 60, 79 (Anšar and Ea), IV.44, VI.123, 147 (Anu and Marduk); *abu* ~ biological father (Anšar and Anu): I.19, II.103; (Anu and Ea) I.19, 89; (Ea and Marduk) I.83, 89, II.127, 131-2, 135; *abu* absolute (as honorific title?): VII.136; Anšar as 'father of the gods': II.125; the gods as 'fathers' of Marduk: IV.2, 27, 33, 64, 84, 133, V.72, 78, 89, 118, 131, VI.71, 83, 85, 109, 126, 140, VII.13, 42, 47, 97, 139; as 'fathers' of Anšar: III.6; Lahmu and Lahamu as 'fathers' of Kakka: III.68. Fatherhood in the biological sense is very rarely to the fore, with Apsû alone being referred to as a 'begetter' (Akk. *zārû*), a term that uniquely stresses his sexual activity.

[39] In the Hittite *Song of Kingship in Heaven*, too, royal succession becomes a matter of family dynamic, but with important differences. First, father-son relationships are less to the fore than in the *Theogony*; cf. van Dongen 2011: 194. Secondly, the storm

god with whom familial violence becomes prominent is the son of Anu (from his seed) but also born of Kumarbi (who carries him in his belly), thus making for a very different intergenerational dynamic. Thirdly, unlike the *Theogony* (and unlike *E.e.*) the Hittite narrative does not involve mothers.

[40] The battle against the Titans provides the closest parallels (Hes. *Th.* 630 etc.).

[41] Hom. *Il.* 1.5; *Od.* 22.323; cf. *Od.* 1.201 = 15.173, 2.156 and 176, 14.160 = 19.305.

[42] For discussion of the image and parallels see West 1966: 341.

[43] Lehrs 1882: 73-5.

[44] *LfgrE* s.v. I 2; cf. Hes. *Th.* 629.

[45] Cf. Hes. *Op.* 120, 136, 139, 706, 718, 730; *Th.* 33, 101.

[46] Clay 1981-2; for similar ideas in Babylonian thought, and especially *Enūma eliš*, see Haubold 2013: 45-6.

[47] For τιμή among the Homeric heroes see Scodel 2008: ch. 1; for the gods see Clay 1989.

[48] *HCer* 366, 443-4, 461-2. One might also mention the *Iliad* (*passim*) and the *Hymn to Hermes* (471, 516).

[49] West 1966: 397.

[50] Detienne and Vernant 1978 rightly emphasise the importance to Zeus of incorporating Metis (e.g. p. 58: 'there would, in effect, be no sovereignty without Metis') – but they understate the fact that she is only one wife among many; see Clay 2003: 30 and 162-4.

[51] For this work see West 1985, Hirschberger 2004, Hunter 2005, Ormand 2014.

[52] Frr 196-204 (M-W).

[53] *E.e.* VI.85-158 and 95-122.

[54] *E.e.* VI.123-VII.142.

[55] Wisnom 2014: 90-207 and Seri 2014 discuss the range of intertextual relationships in *E.e.*; for the poem's revisionist approach see Katz 2011. *Enūma eliš* almost entirely ignores the ancient Mesopotamian god Ellil (Lambert 2013: 457-8) and appropriates the feats of his son Ninurta (Lambert 2013: 202-7).

[56] Wisnom 2014: 206-7 rightly cautions that, for all its intertextual polemics, *E.e.* did not in fact replace its Mesopotamian source texts. They continued to provide the background against which the ascendancy of Marduk was to be read; see also Machinist 2005.

[57] Lambert 2013: 443 argues that the author of *Enūma eliš* does not yet know the god Nabû as the son of Marduk and hence could not have included him in the epic. However, the earliest evidence for Nabû as Marduk's son is almost contemporary with Lambert's own suggested date for *Enūma eliš* (see Lambert 2013: 273 and 276), and the author must in any case have known Zarpānītum as Marduk's wife (Lambert 2013: 251 and 254).

[58] *Atra-hasīs* OB version, Tablet I.

[59] Haubold 2013: 46, Wisnom 2014: 175-6.

[60] Hes. *Th.* 325 (Bellerophontes), 289 etc. (Heracles), 280 (Perseus).

[61] Haubold 2005.

[62] Even in the major Homeric hymns, where we might expect to find θεῶν βασιλεύς often, it is used only once (*HCer.* 358). When Hesiod describes Zeus sleeping with Hera, he calls him 'king of gods and men' (Hes. *Th.* 923), adapting his traditional title of 'father of gods and men' to his role in the succession myth.

[63] Above p. ****.

[64] When the poet describes Hera sleeping with Zeus, he calls him 'king of gods and men' (Hes. *Th.* 923). That is not a traditional epic title but rather an *ad hoc* adaptation of his standard title of 'father of gods and men'.

[65] Thus Solmsen in the OCT, following Jacoby; cf. West 1966: 145.

[66] A similar conclusion is reached by Clay 2003: 162-4, for slightly different reasons. Clay suggests that by providing a 'telescopic vision of the heroic age', the final catalogues of the *Theogony* put 'a meaningful and satisfactory end' to the poem (Clay 2003: 164). But note that this does not preclude the possibility of further continuation, into the *Catalogue of Women*; see Clay 2003: 165-74.

[67] For contradictions between the catalogue of Marduk's names and the main narrative see Lambert 2013: 456. The concept of Mesopotamian *Listenwissenschaft* was first introduced by von Soden 1936, whose discussion is marred by the author's overtly racist outlook; for a critique see Hilgert 2009. For lists in *Enūma eliš* see Seri 2006, Lambert 2013: 142-4 and 153, Myerston 2013: 81-2.

[68] Lambert 2013: 456, n. 34, provides an overview of earlier work.

[69] Seri 2006, esp. pp. 512-15, on the so-called three-column god list; and p. 516, where he discusses passages in the main narrative that are likely to be shaped by the list of Marduk's names.

[70] Myerston 2013: 81-2.

[71] Performance: *E.e.* VI.121-2, 159-66, VII.136, 137-44; instructions for reception and transmission: *E.e.* VII.143-8; for a rare analysis of this passage see Michalowski 1990: 394-6, who focuses on Babylonian scribal culture and the status of *E.e.* as a written text.

[72] As Seri points out, the list of Marduk's name stands *pars pro toto* for an entire tradition of scholarship: 'In *Enūma eliš* the inclusion of an explanatory god list is also an allusion, I believe, to other technical texts such as commentaries and lexical lists that share similar organizational principles' (Seri 2014: 99).